## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Paper No. 12

John Moettelli Bugnion S A Case 375 Geneva CH-12-11 G CH SWITZERLAND

**COPY MAILED** 

JUN 3 0 2004

In re Application of

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS** 

Sauer et al.

Application No. 09/526,783 :

ON PETITION

Filed: March 16, 2000 Title of Invention:

INVALIDATING DEVICE FOR PERFORATING PLANE OBJECTS

under 37 CFR 1.181.

This is a decision on the Second Request for Refund of Erroneous Petition for Request to Withdraw Holding of Abandonment, filed February 3, 2004. The petition is properly treated as a petition

This Petition is hereby dismissed.

Any further petition to revive the above-identified application must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Request for Reconsideration of Petition under 37 CFR 1.137", and be addressed to Petitions Attorney Derek L. Woods. This is **not** final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 704.

A Final Rejection was mailed in this application on September 24, 2002. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on June 18, 2003. Applicant filed a Request (Petition) to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment on July 8, 2003, wherein Applicant argued that a timely response to the Final Rejection was filed. That petition was dismissed in a Decision mailed July 23, 2003, wherein Applicant was advised that the response to the Final Rejection failed to place the application in condition for allowance. The Decision also noted that Applicant had been notified that the response to the Final Rejection failed to place the application in condition for allowance, in an Advisory Action, mailed December 30, 2002.

Applicant subsequently, on August 15, 2003, filed a petition to revive the application on the basis of that the abandonment was unintentional. The August 15, 2003 petition was dismissed by this Office in a Decision mailed October 20, 2003, because Applicant had failed to provide the required reply to the Final Rejection.

Applicant subsequently sought to have the petition fee refunded, alleging that the petition was filed in error. The request for a refund was denied, and Applicant was so notified by correspondence sent December 15, 2003. The correspondence informed Applicant of 37 CFR 1.26, which provides that

["a"] change of purpose after the payment of a fee, such as when a party desires to withdraw a patent or trademark filing for which the fee was paid, including an application, an appeal, or a request for an oral hearing, will not entitle a party to a refund of such fee.

Applicant files the instant Second Request for Refund and argues that the petition to revive the applicant was filed in error because Applicant failed to link the abandoned case to a continuation filed January 24, 2003, which was filed in place of the above-identified abandoned application.

Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the filing of the petition to revive the application was a mistake. Applicant initially filed a response to the Final Rejection on December 18, 2002. Thereafter, Applicant filed the continuing application that Applicant argues obviated the need to revive the instant application. After filing the continuing application, Applicant filed a petition to withdraw the abandonment of the of the instant application. When the petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment was denied, applicant sought to revive the application. Applicant made two attempts to revive the application after filing the continuing application which, Applicant argues, obviated the need for the instant application; the first attempt was to withdraw the abandonment of the application, the second attempt was the petition to revive the application. This Office acted on both petitions, and Decisions were mailed addressing Applicant's arguments in both petitions. For Applicant to now argue that the filing of the petition, for which this Office charged the fee of \$1300.00, was a mistake, is not supported by the actions of Applicant.

After a decision on the petition for reconsideration, no further reconsideration or review of the matter will be undertaken by the Commissioner. Therefore, it is extremely important that petitioner supply any and all relevant information and documentation with his request for reconsideration. The Commissioner's decision will be based solely on the administrative record in existence.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail:

Mail Stop Petitions Commissioner for Patents PO Box 1450 . Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 By FAX:

(703) 872-9306

Attn: Office of Petitions

By hand:

2201 South Clark Place

Customer Window

Crystal Plaza Two, Lobby Room 1B03

Arlington, VA 22202

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter should be directed to the undersigned at (703) 305-0014.

Petitions Attorney Office of Petitions